

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of August 10, 2005. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7-9, 11, 13-16, 18, 20, 22, and 23. Applicant has canceled claims 2, 9, and 16. Consequently, claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-23 remain pending in the present Application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 14 to incorporate the limitations of claims 2, 9, and 16, respectively. Consequently, claims 1, 7, and 14 recite that the message is published on the web browser by pushing the message to the web browser. Claim 1 further recites that this operation is performed through the page builder tool.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,546,387 (Triggs) in view of U.S. Application Publication No. US 2002/0138582 (Chandra). Examiner also rejected claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Triggs in view of Chandra in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,825 (Underwood).

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Triggs in view of Chandra. With respect to claims 2, 9, and 16, the Examiner referred to col. 8, lines 49-67 of Triggs, which describes Microsoft Frontpage uploading information to a server, as teaching pushing the message to the web browser. In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner stated: "[t]he Examiner asserts that the references should be viewed in their entirety rather than only the narrow cited portions. While, the citations are merely guidance and evidentiary clues, the rejections are applied while viewing the combinations of references in their entirety. The Examiner further

asserts that application of the challenged references in their entirety does teach the claimed limitations.”

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection. Independent claim 1 recites a message caching agent for receiving a message. Independent claim 1 further recites the use of a message cache coupled to the message caching agent for storing the message, the message cache receiving the message from the message caching agent, the message cache being a local cache for the page builder tool. Claim 1 also recites the use of a message publishing agent coupled to the message cache and the page builder tool. The message publishing agent retrieves the message from the message cache and allows the message to be published on a web browser through the page builder tool. Claim 1 further recites that the “message publishing agent allows the message to be published on the web browser by pushing the message to the web browser through the page builder tool.” Claims 7 and 14 recite similar method and computer-readable medium claims.

Thus, using the system, method, and computer-readable medium recited in claims 1, 7, and 14, the message can be published using a conventional page builder tool. Specification, page 6, lines 1-2. Moreover, because the message is pushed to the browser, the messages can be published and updated without requiring that the entire web page be refreshed. Specification, page 6, lines 13-15. Thus, the message is published and updated without requiring the user to provide an additional request for data, for example through a refresh. Specification, page 6, lines 8-16. Consequently, publishing of messages is facilitated.

In contrast to the system, method and computer readable medium recited in claims 1, 7, and 14, the system of Triggs does not push the message to a web browser. With respect to claim 1, Triggs neither teaches nor suggests pushing the message to the web browser using a page builder tool. Triggs also fails to teach or suggest a system that does not use a message caching agent to

store the message to a message cache that is a local to and coupled to a page builder tool. Similarly, Triggs neither teaches nor suggests retrieving a message from the local message cache and publish the message through the page builder tool.

Triggs describes a system for managing information on a computer network. Triggs, Abstract. The system of Triggs performs various functions, such as monitoring email accounts and if the appropriate messages are available, posting the messages to a server. Triggs, col. 5, lines 54-57. The Examiner also cited col. 8, lines 49-67 as teaching publishing messages by pushing the messages to the web browser. However, this portion of Triggs merely describes a conventional web builder tool that allows a user to build or add content to a web page. Triggs, col. 8, lines 52-55. Consequently, the new content of the web page is merely uploaded to a server and placed in a particular category of information. Triggs, col. 8, lines 59-64. Employees of the organization who subscribe to the category may be notified that a new content exists. Triggs, col. 8, lines 64-65.

Thus, for both email messages and the web content, new material is merely *uploaded to a server*. Thus, although the web content and email messages may be made available for inspection, the message or web content is not pushed to a web browser. Stated differently, the message or new web content are not broadcast. Instead, at most, certain employees who subscribe to particular information categories may be notified that new content is available. However, Applicant has found no indication in Triggs that this notification includes pushing the content to the web browser. Instead, employees would apparently have to actively access the content, for example by refreshing their browser if they are already on the corresponding web page. Triggs, therefore, fails to teach or suggest publishing a message including pushing the message to the web browser, for example through a page builder tool.

As argued previously, Applicant respectfully reiterates that Triggs fails to teach or suggest a system that uses a message caching agent to store the message to a message cache that is a local to and coupled to a page builder tool and neither teaches nor suggests retrieving a message from the local message cache and publish the message through the page builder tool. Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to arguments made in a previous response to the Final Office Action.

Chandra fails to remedy these defects of Triggs. Chandra describes a method for associating related messages in computer storage. Chandra, Abstract. However, Applicant has found no mention in Chandra of pushing the message being published to web browsers. Instead, any pushing of messages appears limited to email messages. See, for example, Chandra, paragraphs 184 and 536. Applicant agrees that Chandra describes creating "snapshots" of applications, and storing these snapshots in a local cache so that the user can view the snapshots off line. Chandra, paragraph 362. However, Chandra does not broadcast messages using the local cache. Instead, it appears as though the blocks are provided to the local cache for viewing on the client. Thus, the use of the local cache appears limited to the user viewing the applications in the cache that is local to the client system. Chandra, paragraph 362. Stated differently, the local cache is apparently local to the client and possibly the web browser, rather than being local to the page builder tool.

Because Chandra fails to remedy the defects of Triggs, the combination fails to teach or suggest publishing messages by pushing the message to a web browser, particularly through a page builder tool, using a message caching agent to store the message to a message cache that is a local to and coupled to a page builder tool, and retrieving a message from the local message cache and publish the message through the page builder tool. At best, if the teachings of Chandra are added to

those of Triggs, the combination might notify employees who subscribe to certain categories of new web content by pushing an email message to the specific employees. The combination might also download content to an end user's local cache to allow the user. However, the combination would still not publish messages by pushing them to web browsers, use a message caching agent to store the message to a message cache that is a local to and coupled to a page builder tool, or retrieve a message from the local message cache and publish the message through the page builder tool. Consequently, the combination fails to teach or suggest the system, method, and computer-readable medium recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 14.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention in the above-identified Office Action that the references, as combined and viewed as a whole, teach or suggest the limitations in the claims. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion that the cited references teach or suggest the method, system, and computer-readable medium recited in claims 1, 7, and 14. Applicant's arguments are particularly drawn to the portions of the references which the Examiner cited in order to specifically rebut the Examiner's conclusions regarding portions of the references which Applicant presumes best support the Examiner's conclusion. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that even viewed as a whole, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the method, system, and computer-readable medium recited in claims 1, 7, and 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 14 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, and 21 depend upon independent claim 1, 7, or 14. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, and 21 are allowable over the cited references.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Triggs in view of Chandra in further view of Underwood. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 depend upon independent claims 1, 7, and 14. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23. In particular, Triggs in view of Chandra fails to teach or suggest publishing a message by pushing the message to the web browser, particularly through a page builder tool. Triggs in view of Chandra also fail to teach or suggest the use of a message caching agent for storing a message in a cache coupled to the page builder tool, or a message publishing agent for retrieving the message from the cache to publish the message through the page builder tool by pushing the message to the web browser. Underwood fails to remedy these defects of Triggs. Underwood does teach the use of a Web Definer. However, Applicant can find no mention in Underwood of publishing the message by pushing the message to the web browser. Underwood also fails to teach or suggest the use of a message publishing (or other) agent in conjunction with a page builder tool, or storing a message to and retrieving the message from a cache coupled to the page builder tool. Consequently, Underwood fails to remedy the defects of Triggs and Chandra. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 are allowable as presented.

Furthermore, for reasons discussed in the response to the Final Office Action, claims 4, 11, and 18 are separately allowable over the cited references. Claims 4, 11, and 18 recite a system, method, and computer-readable medium, respectively, that uses a message publishing macro definition, coupled to the page builder tool. Claims 4, 11, and 18 further recite that the message publishing macro definition is processed by the page builder tool in response to a request from the web browser and triggers publishing of the message in response to processing of the message

publishing macro definition by the page builder tool. For the reasons discussed in the response to the Final Office Action, Triggs and Chandra in view of Underwood also fail to teach or suggest the use of the message publishing macro definition. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 11, and 18 are separately allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

November 9, 2005
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540